United Nations A/C.1/54/PV.26

General Assembly
Fifty-fourth session

Official Records

First Committee

26th Meeting
Tuesday, 9 November 1999, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Gonzalez . . . . . (Chile)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda items 64, 65 and 67 to 85 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): As delegations were informed at the Committee's meeting yesterday morning, the Committee will proceed this morning to take decisions on the remaining draft resolutions in the Secretariat's informal paper No. 8. May I indicate that a slight, but not substantive, change has been made to this paper. Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1 will be the last draft resolution to be considered by the Committee. The Committee will therefore take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2, A/C.1/54/L.18*, A/C.1/54/L.30 and A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1 this morning.

In connection with the draft resolutions in cluster 1, does any delegation wish to make a general statement? I see none.

The Committee will therefore proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2. Do any delegations wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on that draft resolution?

Ms. Fiffe (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2 is undoubtedly an innovative and timely initiative presented for the Committee's consideration this year. Cuba has carefully followed the evolution of this text and the consultations that have taken place on it. In our opinion, the revised text duly takes into account the views expressed by a number of delegations, including our own. We believe that the best way to make a well-balanced, comprehensive, non-discriminatory approach to the question of missiles is precisely to begin by requesting the opinions of member States on the subject, as the draft resolution before us does. This Committee is the right forum for a multilateral discussion of this timely issue. In this way we can contribute towards avoiding approaches promoted by certain States or groups of States that do not take into account the legitimate interests of the international community. For these reasons, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution, and we hope that it will be given broad support by the other delegations here.

Mr. Reimaa (Finland): It is my honour, on behalf of the European Union (EU), to speak on the draft resolution to which you have just referred, "Missiles", before it is put to a vote in the Committee. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus and Malta, as well as the European Free Trade Association country members of the European Economic Area, Iceland and Norway, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union recognizes the importance of the topic of missile non-proliferation. While we support the basic thrust of the draft resolution, we find it vague in terms of the basic concern regarding the proliferation of missiles and missile technologies. Therefore, the EU has decided to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution. At the same time, the EU emphasizes the need to intensify international efforts to prevent the spread of missiles and missile technologies.

00-40073 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

Mr. Forquenot de la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): I should like to add my delegation's brief comments to what was said by the Presidency of the European Union on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2, on which France has decided to abstain. In view of the rather laconic wording of the draft resolution, it is difficult for us to take a decision on this text. However, the draft gives rise to some questions. It is still ambiguous on the very important problem of missile proliferation, which presents a security challenge because of the development of missiles that might serve as means of delivery for weapons of mass destruction.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2 also gives rise to the question, in particular, of what is meant in the view of the sponsors by the quest for a comprehensive, balanced and non-discriminatory approach to the problem of missiles in the framework of arms regulation. It seems that the reply to this question should be envisaged from the standpoint of the threat inherent in missile proliferation, which means, I repeat, the proliferation of the means of delivery that might be used for weapons of mass destruction. If this really is the wish of the sponsors of this draft resolution, then we would certainly have a number of good suggestions for study.

In this context, the efforts that have been made by a number of countries in favour of missile non-proliferation should be duly taken into account. France, for its part, is fully prepared in due course to help conduct a genuine debate on missile proliferation and the best way to deal with it. Pending that, we will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution. France most earnestly hopes, as it stated during the debate and the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.1/Rev.1, entitled "Preservation of and compliance with the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty", that the true dimension of the problem of missiles will finally be clearly acknowledged.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): There being no other delegation wishing to speak before a decision is taken on the draft resolution, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2, entitled "Missiles", was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the Committee's 25th meeting, on 8 November 1999.

The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2 was adopted by 65 votes to none, with 58 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Guinea, Jordan, Kuwait and Nigeria informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): The United States understands the sentiment behind draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2, "Missiles", but we believe it is premature to bring the issue of missiles into the United Nations system. Accordingly, the United States abstained. Overall, the wording is far too vague, especially in regard to the underlying intent and objectives. The single word "missiles" does not explain the key features of this issue that Member States would be requested to address. We assume the main point is to prevent the proliferation of missiles, even though the draft resolution does not say that. But the problems of missile proliferation are well known, and calling for a comprehensive approach to the issue of missiles in all its aspects will not help curb them.

The United States has been an active participant in seeking to curb missile proliferation. Our most effective efforts have been on a regional basis and have involved those States directly interested and affected. We believe any further efforts should, likewise, emphasize regional aspects. The United States plans to continue its efforts to curb missile proliferation and encourages other Member States to cooperate in the common cause. On the other hand, we seriously doubt that this vague initiative will enhance international peace and security.

Mr. Sungar (Turkey): Turkey's proximity to a region which has a high potential for the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery has always forced us to be vigilant in following developments in this field. That is why we have actively supported all the initiatives aimed at preventing the proliferation of these types of weapons. From that point of view, we welcomed the introduction of this draft resolution in principle. However, besides the vagueness of its language we are concerned that the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution that the Committee has just adopted could be misinterpreted as tacit approval of development and deployment of missiles. We believe that such misinterpretation could seriously hamper disarmament efforts at international and regional levels. That is why my delegation opted to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2, entitled "Missiles".

Mr. Chang Man-soon (Republic of Korea): As my delegation stated during the general debate in the Committee, the proliferation of missiles, as a means of the delivery of weapons of mass destruction, seriously undermines international peace and stability. In particular, the recent test firings conducted in South Asia, the Middle East and North-East Asia show the urgent need for the United Nations to address the missile issue, particularly with regard to the proliferation of ballistic missiles.

In this regard, my delegation, while appreciating some positive elements of the draft resolution, is of the view that it fails to address these concerns properly. Therefore, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2.

Japan shares the concerns expressed by the international community on the proliferation of missiles as delivery vehicles for weapons of mass destruction, and for its part has been making efforts for the non-proliferation of these missiles. Therefore, my delegation appreciates the efforts being made by the Iranian delegation in trying to focus our attention on this issue in the Committee. The reservation we have concerning draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2 is that it has no explicit reference either to concern about the proliferation of missiles as delivery vehicles for weapons of mass destruction, or to recognition of the efforts being made, efforts in which my country participates. Therefore, my delegation abstained in the voting on this draft resolution.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote. The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of and action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.12/Rev.2.

We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*. I shall first call on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution.

Mr. Soutar (United Kingdom): May I begin by welcoming the willingness of the sponsors of this draft resolution to engage in dialogue with other delegations. I regret that we nevertheless feel obliged again to vote against the draft resolution on this subject this year. Perhaps I might briefly explain the reasons for that decision.

The United Kingdom has made clear its commitment to nuclear disarmament and to its obligations under article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. This commitment has been given recent practical expression by the measures announced in 1998 in the United Kingdom's strategic defence review. These included significant reductions in, and unprecedented transparency about, the British nuclear deterrent. Our commitment to forward progress was further underlined by the United Kingdom's

ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty in 1998.

We share the frustration of the sponsors of the draft resolution at the slow pace of wider progress towards nuclear disarmament. We continue to urge faster progress in bilateral efforts to reduce the nuclear arsenals of the two major nuclear Powers. We are eager to see the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty brought into force at the earliest opportunity and have played a leading role in international efforts to that end. We are impatient to begin negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty, which is the internationally agreed next step towards nuclear disarmament.

We recognize that this draft resolution includes support for all these measures, which constitute the core of the principles and objectives agreed at the 1995 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference, but we question whether by going beyond that internationally agreed agenda and proposing a range of further measures, a number of which plainly do not command consensus support at the present time, this draft resolution is likely to make a practical contribution to forward progress towards nuclear disarmament. As in the resolution last year, this draft resolution contains many measures the United Kingdom strongly supports, but it also includes some we do not, including, for example, the demating of warheads from delivery vehicles, which we examined in detail in the course of the strategic defence review and concluded was, at the present time, incompatible with the maintenance of a credible minimum deterrent. We remain committed to supporting any measures that we judge would make a practical contribution to advancing the cause of nuclear disarmament.

Ms. Martinic (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): Argentina shares the objectives of the international community in promoting disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda", contains elements with which Argentina does not concur. It is our hope that in the future draft resolutions on this subject will be drafted in terms that are acceptable to a larger number of members. For these reasons, the delegation of Argentina will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*.

Mr. Al-Ahmed (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*.

Mr. Forquenot de la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): The First Committee is being called upon to take a decision for the second year in a row on a draft resolution entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda". Those in favour of this text stress its median approach, as well as the many improvements they have made to this year's draft resolution relative to last year's. If there is no doubt that some of these provisions meet the criterion of realism, for my delegation this draft, submitted by seven States, continues to give rise to a number of substantial problems that still make it just as unacceptable as the one presented at the fifty-third session. We find its general approach just as dangerous, and some of its proposals are just as open to criticism or are ambiguous. We believe the general approach is a dangerous one, and the question is, "why a new agenda?" France has always advocated, and will continue to advocate, the implementation of the programme of action defined by the decision of the 1995 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) Review and Extension Conference, and it cannot subscribe to the appeal for a new agenda that would call into question the 1995 agenda, which, I recall had three items: first, the implementation of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT); secondly, the conclusion and implementation of a fissile material cut-off treaty; and, thirdly, the commitment of nuclear-weapon States to progress systematically and gradually to reduce nuclear weapons as a whole and then to eliminate them, and the commitment of all States to work towards general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international monitoring.

Do the sponsors of this initiative believe that the programme of action has become outdated? If so, they should say so clearly. Why should one refer in operative paragraph 16 to the importance of full implementation, while at the same time calling for a new agenda for nuclear disarmament? To us, there seems to be an obvious contradiction, unless there is some hidden ulterior motive.

From the impressive number of proposals made in this document, I will refer here only to the following few. First, why consideration of nuclear policies and positions? The United Nations Charter acknowledges the right of every State, large or small, to legitimate self-defence, a universal right that is equal for all, without any corollary, and that any State can define in accordance with its legitimate needs for defence and security in the framework of existing treaties. It follows that defence policies and positions cannot be decided arbitrarily by anybody but the State concerned. How can the promoters of this initiative,

who rightly wish their sovereignty to be respected, tolerate the international community's defining for them their defence policies and positions? The answer is obviously that they cannot. I would add simply that the nuclear policy of France is based on the principle of the least possible sufficiency compatible with its security, and it is constantly adapting its doctrine and its means to the development of potential threats.

Why an international conference on disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons? Let us be clear. The five nuclear-weapon States have always opposed the idea of convening an international conference of this nature. We are not among those who think that the process of reducing nuclear arsenals would be more effective if it were to be dealt with within such a framework. What would be the benefit and usefulness of a conference in which the nuclear-weapon States would not take part? The 2000 NPT Review Conference would be the ideal occasion on which to deal with non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. We do not think that it would be right to subscribe to this proposal simply to follow the fashion. Should we subscribe to this proposal simply to satisfy the pride of some? We think not.

Why is there such ambiguity on the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference? How can one explain the delegations' suggestion that the 1995 consensus on the programme of action is somehow outmoded, that the four years that have elapsed since then have laid it to rest, when those same delegations are insisting that we do not tamper, because of its almost sacrosanct character, with a document from 1978 that does not seem to be showing a single wrinkle, despite the fundamental changes in the international arena. The ambiguity is great and is difficult to explain.

Finally, why is there such ambiguity with regard to the cut-off treaty? The delegations that, last September in Geneva, staunchly refused to include a simple reference to General Assembly resolution 53/77 I, on the cut-off treaty, which was adopted by consensus in 1998, resorting to false pretexts, linkages with other items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament or practices that no one can see any written trace of — how can it be explained that those countries did not hesitate to appeal, in October in New York, for a special committee to be re-established in Geneva to pursue and conclude negotiations without delay, under operative paragraph 12 of the draft resolution. Here there is ambiguity, if not a contradiction, that is difficult to explain. The only way to dispel any doubts about the good faith of the promoters would be to have a simple phrase inserted at the beginning of operative paragraph 12, so that it would read,

> "*Calls upon* the Conference on Disarmament to re-establish without conditions, or any linkage with any other items, the Ad Hoc Committee".

The rest of the sentence could remain unchanged. If this is not to be the case, then we believe that the sponsors are using double-talk with the only goal of having the most credulous delegations succumb to the siren's call. The experience of drafting paragraph 24 of the report of the Conference on Disarmament to the Assembly was very instructive for us in many ways.

Some of the promoters of this draft resolution have for some years been the most ardent advocates of an approach to disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, that they call a policy of constructive ambiguity, and they are the most skilful experts in double-talk. The draft submitted to us this year has these two aspects to it, and we feel that nuclear disarmament is too serious a topic to be dealt with in an ambiguous and even contradictory manner. This should be done as clearly as possible, of course. Members will understand that in such circumstances my delegation, which has always preferred to talk straight rather than be politically correct, will vote against this text, as it has before.

Mr. Chomar (Mozambique): My delegation wishes to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*. My delegation thinks that it is very important that the new agenda should be in place for the countries concerned, including my own country. That is why we decided to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Ms. Fiffe (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/54/L.18* in some ways does not reflect Cuba's traditional positions on nuclear disarmament. Nonetheless, the fact that this draft emphasizes the need for a new agenda for a nuclear-weapon-free world gives it its own merits that we recognize and that we commend. My delegation believes that the final balance sheet of the draft resolution is positive and that its adoption would, as part of a broad group of other initiatives, contribute to the promotion of our priority objective in the field of disarmament, which is nuclear disarmament. For those reasons, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

We appreciate the values of the text, and the fact that we are going to vote positively on it should not be taken to

mean that we approve of each and every idea in the text. Among the paragraphs that give my delegation cause for concern, and on which I recall that my delegation has requested a separate vote, are operative paragraphs 7 and 18.

Cuba is not a party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, because we consider it to be fundamentally discriminatory and selective. We are against the fact that it legitimizes the nuclear Powers and creates two categories of States with different rights and obligations. We do not believe that this is the way to make progress towards the urgent objective of nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons. It is for this reason that in the separate vote on operative paragraph 7 my delegation will abstain.

As for operative paragraph 18, we reiterate that the security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should be universal and unconditional. Cuba cannot accept such guarantees being provided only to States parties to a given treaty.

We recognize the good intentions of the main sponsors of the draft resolution and their priority interest, shared by Cuba, in achieving nuclear disarmament. For this reason our delegation will vote in favour of the text as a whole.

Mr. Al-Hariri (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I only wish to draw the attention of the Secretariat to an error in the Arabic text of the draft resolution.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We have now concluded explanations of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*.

Mr. Fruchtbaum (Solomon Islands): I wish to ask whether or not a co-sponsor of a draft resolution can take a point of personal privilege.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The answer is no.

Mr. Fruchtbaum (Solomon Islands): Can we take a point of personal privilege after the voting?

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): That can be done only in the framework of general statements on all draft resolutions and before taking a decision on any of the draft resolutions. Unfortunately, as a sponsor you do not have that privilege.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation is a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18* and for that reason we have no right to make an explanation of vote, nor should I have to be speaking now to say that every delegation has the right to vote as it pleases, but there is no right to offend those who submit draft resolutions. Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18* — and I want to correct a speaker who preceded me — was not presented by seven delegations. The number of co-sponsors is more than 60 at present. In the draft resolution there are no ulterior motives or hidden agendas. I am very sorry to have had to have said what I had no right to say.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We will proceed to the vote, because I do not think there is any point in our getting involved in a dispute that does not relate to the substance of the issue. But I would ask that we focus on what we have in front of us right now and not try to find entitlements in the rules that the rules really do not give us. Let us try to maintain the atmosphere that has prevailed up to the second to last day of the Committee's work.

Before giving the floor to the representative of Solomon Islands I would say that if he wishes to make a statement it could be made as a statement of a general nature after the decision-making on the draft resolution. Would that be acceptable? That is agreed.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda", was introduced by the representative of New Zealand at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 26 October 1999. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18* are contained in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/54/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Angola, Guyana, Jamaica, Mozambique and Saudi Arabia.

Separate votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 7 and 18.

The Committee will now proceed to vote on operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I call on the representative of Algeria on a point of order.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): I apologize, but I think that last year we agreed that every

time there was to be a separate vote the Secretariat should read out the paragraph in full so that all delegations would know exactly what they were voting on.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will certainly read out the paragraph in full.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Previous practice is that preambular paragraphs would be read out, but operative paragraphs are clearly indicated. But as there has been a request, I will read it out.

Operative paragraph 7 reads as follows:

"*Calls upon* those States that have not yet done so to adhere unconditionally and without delay to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to take all the necessary measures which flow from adherence to this instrument as non-nuclear-weapon States".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Cuba, Latvia

Operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18 was retained by 128 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.*

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting on operative paragraph 18.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 18 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*. Operative paragraph 18 reads as follows:

"*Calls for* the conclusion of an internationally legally binding instrument to effectively assure non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland,

Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Cuba, India, Israel, Pakistan, Republic of Korea

Operative paragraph 18 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18 was retained by 128 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Bulgaria, Estonia, France, Hungary, India, Israel, Monaco, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18, as a whole, was adopted by 90 votes to 13, with 37 abstentions.*

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position. In order to avoid any difficulties, I urge delegations to respect as closely as possible the rules of procedure; otherwise, we will get into disputes that do not help us at all and make our work more difficult.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China has always stood for the complete prohibition and total elimination of nuclear weapons with a view to freeing humanity from the threat of nuclear warfare and bringing about, at an early date, a nuclear-weapon-free world. In this context, China fully understands the concern and request of the international community regarding the issue of nuclear disarmament.

The Chinese delegation supports the principles and goals of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*, namely, the complete prohibition and total elimination of nuclear weapons and the achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free world. We also support some of the specific steps put forward in the draft resolution, including calling upon nuclear-weapon States to review their nuclear doctrines; to conclude an internationally legally binding instrument to effectively assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons; to strengthen the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; and to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones. Preserving the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty

and keeping it from being weakened or even repudiated, and stopping the development of anti-missile systems, which undermines global strategic stability, are the necessary conditions for progress in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

In this connection, draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18* rightly points out that the ABM Treaty remains the cornerstone of strategic stability. On the other hand, however, we have noted that other measures are also called for in the draft resolution, such as the de-alerting of nuclear weapons, the removal of nuclear warheads from delivery vehicles and demonstrating transparency on nuclear arsenals and fissile material inventories. China believes that these mentioned measures could be taken only in an international environment of peace, security, stability and trust, and should be linked with negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Under the current unsettling international circumstances, the time is not yet ripe and the necessary conditions are not present for taking such measures.

It should also be pointed out that the draft resolution fails to urge all nuclear-weapon States to commit themselves to the non-first-use of nuclear weapons and not using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against all non-nuclear-weapon countries. These elements, however, are crucial to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

For these reasons, the Chinese delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*.

Mr. Lint (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour of speaking on behalf of Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Slovakia and Spain to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda".

We welcome and fully agree with the commitment expressed in the draft resolution to achieve nuclear disarmament with the ultimate objective of a nuclear-free world. We think that we can better achieve that objective by urgently pursuing the gradual process of nuclear disarmament. We observe with concern that this process might be seriously hindered by the lack of progress concerning the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and by differences on the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

We can agree with many of the elements contained in the draft resolution. We, too, are concerned by a number of negative developments in the area of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. We, too, are convinced that new momentum is needed to revitalize the nuclear-disarmament process and non-proliferation, although we are not convinced that new machinery or new institutions would be necessary to achieve that end.

We recognize that the sponsors of the draft resolution have made serious efforts to take into account some of the objections related to the text adopted last year. We can, moreover, support many of the recommendations in the draft resolution. That being said, some elements still remain that do not, in our view, reflect the most appropriate manner in which to achieve the ultimate objectives that we have set ourselves and on which we are in agreement.

We continue to attach the greatest importance to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which is the cornerstone of the global non-proliferation regime and the essential foundation for nuclear disarmament. We firmly believe that any progress in the area of nuclear disarmament can be achieved only through the current process — that is, the process based on article VI of the NPT and the goals defined in the 1995 principles and objectives. Efforts in this context have already made considerable progress but have also had serious setbacks. We believe that we should redouble our efforts in order to overcome those setbacks and to make new progress on the basis of the agreed principles and objectives.

The objective of the universality of the NPT remains of the highest importance. Efforts to this end encountered the greatest setbacks in the history of the NPT, following nuclear testing last year in South Asia. Overcoming these setbacks should become an even more urgent priority. Bilateral negotiations between the United States and Russia have had important results in the nuclear-disarmament process but have not made as much progress in recent years as we had hoped. It is urgent to revitalize these efforts in order to ensure the entry into force of START II and the opening, without delay, of negotiations on START III.

We most earnestly regret the American Senate vote against the CTBT, and welcome with satisfaction the public commitment of President Clinton to continue to work for the ratification of the Treaty and to continue to observe a moratorium on nuclear testing. International efforts for the prompt entry into force of the CTBT should be continued with increased determination. Negotiations on a non-

discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices are long overdue. We ask the Conference on Disarmament to begin, without delay and without preconditions, negotiations on such a treaty.

Even if nuclear disarmament comes first and foremost within the purview of the nuclear States, it is also a legitimate concern of the international community. Consequently, we support the establishment by the Conference on Disarmament of an ad hoc working group to study ways and means to begin an exchange of information and views on efforts for nuclear disarmament, as proposed by Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Norway in February 1999.

In order to make progress in the area of nuclear disarmament, we need shared responsibility and the political will to continue and to achieve the existing objectives. Countries will not be judged by resolutions or declarations, but by their actions towards the achievement of these objectives. In this regard, the most immediate objectives would be the success of the NPT Review Conference next year and the opening of negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices at the beginning of the next session of the Conference on Disarmament. We will continue to pursue these objectives actively and constructively, and we are prepared to cooperate closely with the sponsors of this draft resolution, as well as with all States, both nuclear and non-nuclear, with a view to achieving our common objectives.

Ms. Kunadi (India): My delegation understands that the genesis of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18* began with the Joint Declaration issued in Dublin on behalf of eight countries in June 1998. India welcomed that Declaration. However, this draft resolution goes far beyond the parameters of the Joint Declaration.

The Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament (SSOD I), remains the only consensus document on disarmament adopted by the international community as a whole. The Final Document contained a programme of action which remains only partially implemented. Any agenda for the future would necessarily have to take into account as the starting premise, the implementation of the programme of action contained in the Final Document of SSOD I.

It is evident that on the most important element, nuclear disarmament, the international community has made little progress. The question we need to pose is whether there is a need for a new agenda when the most important element in the existing agenda remains yet to be accomplished. The draft resolution includes extraneous elements and formulations that were adopted in other forums. We reject restrictive approaches concerning security issues, such as those contained in operative paragraphs 6, 7 and 8, that are not only extraneous to this draft resolution but are also completely divorced from reality on the ground. India no longer has a nuclear-weapons option. That option has been exercised.

The draft resolution also tends to base its recommendations on fallacious concepts, such as, in paragraph 6,

> "those three States that are nuclear-weapons-capable and that have not yet acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons".

This concept is analytically hollow and does not correspond to reality.

The reference to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia not only borders on the absurd but also calls into question one of the fundamental guiding principles for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, namely, that the arrangements for such zones should be freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. This principle was again endorsed by the Disarmament Commission during its substantive session this year. As we have stated on other occasions as well, given current realities, the proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia has as much validity as would proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones in East Asia, Western Europe or North America.

Given the omnibus nature of this draft resolution, there is a surprising lack of any mention of doctrines of first use of nuclear weapons. The only remaining transcontinental military alliance, whose security policy is predicated on nuclear weapons, reaffirmed its nuclear-doctrine policy of first use of nuclear weapons earlier this year. Similarly, the draft resolution ignores efforts in certain countries to refine and modernize nuclear weapons for retention well into the next millennium. The ongoing efforts to build ballistic missile defences could well have the effect of further eroding the international climate conducive to the promotion of disarmament and the strengthening of international peace and security. Instead of

emphasizing the gravity of these actions, which place in peril the entire fabric of multilateral disarmament efforts, some three paragraphs of the draft resolution have been redrafted to make them more palatable to the established nuclear-weapon States.

The draft resolution is also silent on the current impasse in the Conference on Disarmament due to the inflexibility shown by a few delegations on the questions of nuclear disarmament and outer space, ignoring the express wishes of the vast majority of its members, which support the commencement of substantive negotiations as part of a balanced and comprehensive programme of work.

My delegation's views on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) are well known. This draft resolution attempts to revive the sagging fortunes of a Treaty that has disappointed the vast majority of its States parties. We sympathize with those that have been striving unsuccessfully over the years, including at the third session of the NPT Review Conference Preparatory Committee this year, to get the self-anointed five nuclear-weapon States to accept unequivocal commitments for nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. The draft resolution is silent on the multifarious sources of proliferation which the NPT has failed to stem. We believe that all such efforts, however worthy and energetic in their own right, would be limited by the unequal and discriminatory framework of obligations enshrined in the NPT.

As we have maintained, a new agenda cannot succeed in the old framework of the NPT. The need therefore is to move beyond the old framework and move towards a system which ensures a durable system of international security based on the principle of equal and legitimate security for all.

We would have expected that this draft resolution would have included proposals contained in the Final Document of the Twelfth Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in 1998 in South Africa, that country being one of the sponsors of the draft resolution. That Final Document included concrete proposals towards a nuclear-weapon-free world, particularly the call for an international conference with the objective of reaching agreement on a phased elimination of nuclear weapons. Similarly, we would have preferred the designation of the use of weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, as a crime against humanity within the purview of the International Criminal Court.

Although my delegation also shares the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the need to work for a nuclear-weapon-free world, we remain unconvinced of the utility of an exercise bound by the flawed and discriminatory approaches of the NPT. We therefore cast a negative vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): While respecting the motivations of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*, the United States voted "no" on it for a number of reasons. The most notable of these is that we cannot support the fundamental premise on which it is based, namely, that there is a need for a new agenda for nuclear disarmament.

As Under-Secretary-designate Holum said on 20 October during the general debate, we already have a broad, multilateral arms control agenda awaiting completion. However frustrating the current pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament may be, the facts nevertheless demonstrate that we have made dramatic progress in nuclear arms reductions since the height of the cold war. The record shows that disarmament is best achieved through practical, incremental steps, each building on its predecessors and each taking into account the realities of the international security environment. This is painstakingly difficult work, but it produces results. We do not think that draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18* will help reinvigorate the disarmament process. Let me offer two illustrative reasons why.

The draft resolution, in paragraph 1,

> "*Calls upon* the nuclear-weapon States to make an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the speedy and total elimination of their nuclear arsenals and to engage without delay in an accelerated process of negotiations".

If the solemn undertakings already made in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which the United States takes very seriously, are not sufficient, what good would it do to add yet another undertaking?

The draft resolution also calls for an international conference on nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation to complement efforts in other settings. International conferences have their place, but we already have more of them than we can put to good use. Another layer of international discussion will not speed progress towards nuclear disarmament. The United States believes

that the current disarmament agenda is full enough. Indeed, draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18* embraces most of it.

We also believe that it is past time to begin in earnest negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a cut-off of the production of fissile material. The General Assembly has endorsed this project, and this, rather than a new agenda, is the sort of concrete, practical step we need to reinvigorate the process of nuclear disarmament.

As Mr. Holum said, we need to make renewed efforts to reinvigorate the current agenda we have, not to try to create a new one.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): My delegation shares the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world and appreciates the enthusiasm of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18* to lay out an extended series of concrete measures to reach the goal. It is the view of my Government that in order to reach the goal there is no other way than proceeding step by step through realistic and concrete measures. In this regard, we need to have cooperation from the nuclear-weapon States, and it is not necessarily constructive to take a confrontational attitude vis-à-vis these States.

It is also the view of Japan that the pace of nuclear disarmament is far from satisfactory, but an attempt to short-cut the process out of frustration would not be productive.

We recognize improvements in this year's draft resolution. On the other hand, it still betrays a degree of scepticism towards the commitment of the nuclear-weapon States.

After careful and serious consideration Japan finally decided to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution. Nevertheless, I would like to re-emphasize that my country fully shares the goal and necessity of creating a world free of nuclear weapons. I would like to urge member States, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, to make their utmost efforts for a successful outcome of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons 2000 Review Conference. In order to ensure that, accelerated efforts for the ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, particularly by the three nuclear-weapon States which have not yet done so, as well as progress in the bilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament between the United States and the Russian Federation, would surely help create a conducive atmosphere. We also call for intensified efforts to reach an agreement at that Conference on updated objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, based on the review of achievements since 1995.

Mr. Sungar (Turkey): As a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and other international agreements in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, Turkey has always shared the aspiration of the international community to a world free of nuclear weapons. My country continues to believe that systematic and progressive efforts by nuclear-weapon States are essential for the reduction of nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons within the framework of general and complete disarmament.

Since last year's resolution contained certain elements and contradictions which made it difficult for us to support, we opted to vote against it and explained our reasons for doing so. This year, however, we think that there are some improvements both in language and substance which made it possible for us to change our vote to an abstention.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): In spite of some imperfections and some wording that from the Algerian standpoint should be reviewed, my delegation joined in voting in favour of this draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*. Algeria supports all efforts aimed at non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. This draft resolution is part of those efforts and supplements those made elsewhere. Algeria, which agrees with the idea of a nuclear-weapon-free world, essentially supports the measures considered in this draft resolution and welcomes the improvements made this year to it and hopes that the sponsors will continue to improve upon it in order to enable those delegations that still have difficulties with it to support it.

Mr. Al-Hariri (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation is committed to nuclear disarmament, and on this basis we supported the draft resolution. But we would like to place on record our reservation on operative paragraph 9, which deals with the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, for the reasons earlier indicated by my delegation when the draft resolution on that Treaty was adopted.

Mr. Chang Man-soon (Republic of Korea): As we have expressed on many occasions, the Republic of Korea has consistently supported international efforts to strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime and to achieve the ultimate goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world. In this regard, my delegation appreciates the sincere efforts of the

sponsors of this draft resolution aimed at setting a new agenda for a nuclear-weapon-free world. We understand the main thrust of this draft resolution and support some of its elements, such as operative paragraphs 7, 8, 9 and 12. These issues constitute key components in upholding the principles and objectives of the nuclear-non-proliferation regime.

Despite these positive elements, however, we believe that any nuclear disarmament measures should be based on reality. Steady improvements in the global security environment, along with a practical and incremental approach, can bring about concrete results on the road to the ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons. At the same time, the strengthening of and the securing of compliance with the existing multilateral agreements related to nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament are no less important than producing new agreements. The continuing non-compliance with obligations of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards agreements by a handful of countries poses a serious challenge to the international community. These concerns are not adequately reflected in this draft resolution. For these reasons, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*.

Mr. Luck (Australia): The Australian delegation finds that the proposed new agenda draft resolution warrants a great deal of reflective thought, as was no doubt intended by its authors. The new agenda coalition has worked assiduously to prepare a comprehensive draft resolution on nuclear disarmament designed to attract wide support. The result is a draft resolution whose particular virtue is to call attention to the important unfinished business involved in the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. The authors have sought to do this in a measured and even-handed way, directing their appeals to the five nuclear-weapon States as well as those countries outside the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). In the process, they have provoked a great deal of thought and discussion not only here but also in national forums.

Taken individually, there are few elements of the draft resolution that Australia would object to, although we do have significant reservations about what might be achieved by an international conference on nuclear disarmament. Aspects of the draft resolution are worthy of strong support. There is appropriate reference, for example, to mainstream non-proliferation and disarmament objectives and to the importance of adherence to the NPT and of the universality of the Treaty. Similarly, calls for States to sign the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and commence negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty reiterate worthy existing priorities.

We have concerns, however, with the draft resolution taken as a whole and the message it sends. We find its broadly positive content to be overshadowed by a premise, especially in its preambular paragraphs, which casts doubt on the commitment of the nuclear-weapon States to the undertakings they have made in article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty to "pursue negotiations in good faith" on nuclear disarmament. By calling for a new agenda the draft resolution signals a belief that the existing non-proliferation regime is failing.

These are not contentions we accept or believe are helpful to make, and it is essentially for this reason that Australia finds itself once again unable to support such a draft resolution. Accordingly, we have registered an abstention.

We also question whether, despite its aspirations, the draft resolution offers compelling new insights into the course which nuclear disarmament must take. It rehearses a familiar and largely accepted agenda, but it risks offering false hope if it is taken to suggest that nuclear disarmament is likely to be anything other than a complex incremental process in which each step is evaluated for the security benefits it will bring.

Australia supports practical, realistic proposals on nuclear disarmament which are capable of winning the support of all States, including the nuclear-weapon States. Although proponents of the new agenda draft resolution are yet to achieve this, Australia shares their desire to see further negotiations among the nuclear-weapon States. We want to see reductions in nuclear warhead numbers which are stable and verifiable. We recognize that this can only be achieved when the nuclear-weapon States themselves have negotiated, and therefore have confidence in, the measures being taken. While the main onus for nuclear disarmament lies with the nuclear-weapon States for the time being, the non-nuclear-weapon States can make an important contribution by moving expeditiously with steps which reinforce non-proliferation and disarmament goals such as encouraging the entry into force of the CTBT and the negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty.

Mr. Tomaszewski (Poland): Like last year, when the draft resolution on the need for a new agenda for a nuclear-weapon-free world was submitted for the first time, Poland cast a negative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*, but not because it disagrees with the content of the draft

resolution. On the contrary, let me assure the Committee that we agree with most of the stipulations contained in the draft resolution.

Poland was, and still is, committed to the ultimate objective of nuclear disarmament. Six months ago the Government of the Republic of Poland deposited its instrument of ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

At the same time, we believe that the international community should be realistic in setting measures to attain that ultimate objective. Poland has always been of the view that the objective should be attained on a step-by-step basis. If we look from a 20-year perspective, we realize that much has been done towards a nuclear-weapon-free world since the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1978. True, recently we are witnessing some setbacks on the road, but it seems only natural that, living in a rapidly changing world, we have to face and deal effectively with such setbacks.

In our view the draft resolution is trying to artificially accelerate the process of attaining the ultimate goal — not on the main road, but on a side track, where the permanent members of the Security Council, those with special responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, are absent. We are convinced that without their participation the best new agenda will not be able to accelerate the process of attaining the ultimate goal. Therefore, it is only after we have secured the participation of all the permanent members of the Security Council in the new agenda that Poland will be convinced of the effectiveness of those efforts.

Mr. Neewoor (Mauritius): Mauritius abstained in the voting on the draft resolution on account of operative paragraph 9, which calls upon States that have not signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) to do so. Mauritius is not a signatory of the CTBT, the reason being that it fails to provide the framework for a timetable for the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Westdal (Canada): Canada abstained on the new agenda draft resolution last year and decided to maintain its abstention again this year, on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*. In both cases the decision was the product of careful, very intensive, high-level consideration. I speak now to share some of the thinking underlying that decision.

Our decision was not, for the most part, a response to the text of the draft resolution. This year's text has evolved considerably and favourably relative to the text that we examined last year. The Government of Canada also shares much of the new agenda coalition's assessment of the serious strains on the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime based on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The new agenda draft resolution remains a very timely and pointed reminder of the urgent need for further progress on both these fronts. In our view, however, concerted action to address the many challenges facing the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime will require the broadest possible base of support. The nuclear-weapon States and their partners and alliances need to be engaged if the goals of the new agenda draft resolution are to be achieved. For our part, we intend to continue to cooperate with all like-minded States in the relevant forums to build greater support for advancing the key aims of the nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament regime.

As a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Canada was pleased to note the increase in the number of NATO non-nuclear-weapon States sharing a common position in this year's voting. We look forward to NATO's consideration of non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament options mandated by the Washington Summit. We see this process as one of the avenues for addressing the critical issues raised by the new agenda draft resolution. As Minister Axworthy said in Boston on 22 October, the Canadian Government believes it is crucial for NATO to have an arms control and disarmament policy that reflects the next decade, not the last.

The issues addressed by the new agenda coalition draft resolution will be before us again in the April/May 2000 NPT Review Conference, when the accountability promised in the indefinite extension of the Treaty in 1995 will be put to an important public test. As I indicated in our general statement to the Committee, the Canadian Government will be working to ensure that next spring's Review Conference reinforces the Treaty and restores momentum to the fulfilment of its goals.

My explanation of our vote ends there, but I believe that I am the last speaker in the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.18*. I therefore take the liberty of addressing briefly the next subject on our agenda, draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.30, on the fissile material cut-off treaty, which this year Canada introduced.

The sponsors have agreed with the view I expressed in introducing the draft resolution that it should be adopted

without a vote. We have since been advised that there has been a request for a vote. Before action is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/54.L.30, therefore, I request a 30-minute suspension of the proceedings to allow the sponsors to meet and to decide how they want to proceed with the draft resolution.

Should you agree to this suspension, Mr. Chairman, a meeting of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.30 would follow immediately in Conference Room A.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Before the Committee decides on the request made to the Committee by the representative of Canada, I call on the representative of Solomon Islands to make a general statement.

Mr. Fruchtbaum (Solomon Islands): The heat that I felt at what I took to be an insult by a previous speaker to my delegation and to the other sponsors of the new agenda draft resolution has cooled, and instead of making a statement I just will not speak to him again in the delegates' bar.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I hope that does not include the Chairman.

I think we are getting past the obstacles that have arisen.

I want to make a very serious appeal. I have tried from the very outset to be as careful as possible so that all delegations — I emphasize, all delegations — have an equal right to present draft resolutions. I do not think anyone has a right to ridicule draft resolutions. It is one thing to disagree on substance, and it is quite another to ridicule. That seems to me to run counter to our most basic principles, every delegation has an enshrined right including the sovereign and inviolable right of all delegations to put forward draft resolutions. Members are free to interpret this as they will, but I think it is clear to everyone what we are talking about.

The representative of Canada has made a request. The Chair has no objection. Quite the contrary: we believe this would contribute to expediting our work. But I would ask that we stick to what we might term a Swiss half hour, a real half hour, so that we can conclude our work this morning. It is now 11.45 a.m. The Committee will meet again at 12.15 p.m. sharp.

I call on the representative of Egypt on a point of order.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): May my delegation suggest that we go now to cluster 6 and finish the draft resolutions therein, and then suspend the meeting for 30 minutes?

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): That is a very good suggestion. We will turn to cluster 6.

I call on the representative of Japan on a point of order.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): In the same spirit as that stated by the representative of Egypt, my delegation would like action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1 to be taken before the suspension of the meeting.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I call on the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Twenty-four hours have not yet elapsed since the distribution of the revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9. I would suggest that draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1 be the last draft resolution on which we take a decision today.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I am in the hands of the Committee members. Another approach might be to wait for the 24 hours to elapse — I think that is in about 15 minutes — and then we come back to draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1, and then we take the half hour. We would be strictly applying the rules of procedure. Can anyone tell me, or can the representative of Mexico tell me, when exactly the 24 hours would be up?

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation received draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1 at 12.15 p.m. yesterday.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): There is a suggestion from Mexico that we could apply as follows. We suspend until 12.15 p.m. and then meet to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1. We suspend again for half an hour and then meet on the other draft resolution. The Committee is telling me that we cannot take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1 because the 24-hour period has not yet expired.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): As a notion of order, Canada has requested that we suspend for half an hour. Motions of order for suspension take precedence over anything else. Why not suspend for half an hour, as requested by the representative of Canada, and

then meet again at 12.20 p.m. and continue in the order that had been set?

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I will give you a very direct answer to that. It is because the representative of Egypt and the representative of Japan asked that the suspension not take place until we had first taken action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1. Would the representatives of Egypt and Japan agree that we could suspend the meeting and then come back and take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1?

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): My delegation would prefer to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1 before the suspension of the meeting.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I call on the representative of Canada.

Mr. Westdal (Canada): I did not want to derail the Committee. I made my request that there be a suspension before we came to draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.30 simply because it was next on the list. Would a solution not be to deal now with draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1, then have our suspension, and then to come back to draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1, by which time 24 hours will have passed?

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Very well, that is what we will do.

Does any delegation wish to make a general statement on draft resolutions in cluster 6?

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1.

I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Reimaa (Finland): It is my honour, on behalf of the European Union (EU) to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments", before it is put to the vote. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries, Cyprus and Malta, as well as the European Free Trade Association country members of the European Economic Area, Iceland and Norway, align themselves with this statement. The States subscribing to this explanation of vote will vote against the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1 is not acceptable on grounds of principle. Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1, like previous General Assembly resolutions 52/38 B and 53/77 S, puts the concept of transparency in conventional arms, as implemented through the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, on a par with the concept of transparency in relation to weapons of mass destruction. As the Committee will recall, the European Union and the countries associated with this statement voted against those resolutions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1, as did last year's resolution, reinforces the attempted linkage between additional progress in the development of the United Nations Register and greater transparency concerning weapons of mass destruction. The European Union is fully aware that positions on this subject were reconsidered. However, whatever the views on the way to promote transparency of weapons of mass destruction, this cannot be linked either to transparency in the field of conventional weapons in general or to the United Nations Register in particular. This view of the European Union applies also to the work of the Group of Governmental Experts that will be convened in the year 2000 to discuss the development of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

For these reasons, the European Union and the States aligning themselves with my statement will be compelled to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1.

Ms. Martinic (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation wishes to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments". In spite of the fact that the Register of Conventional Arms refers to these weapons, the principle of transparency can also be applied, together with other measures, to weapons of mass destruction and to transfers of technology for high-level military application, as pointed out in the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the continuing operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, and its further development.

That view is already reflected in operative paragraph 4 (a) of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.39, introduced by the Netherlands and co-sponsored by my delegation . For that reason, we do not consider it necessary to adopt another draft resolution on the same matter. As we have stated at earlier General Assembly sessions, my delegation believes that the development of transparency mechanisms in the

field of weapons of mass destruction should not have the effect of undermining the efficiency and effectiveness of existing mechanisms for providing transparency in conventional arms, such as the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

For that reason, my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1.

Mr. Du Preez (South Africa): South Africa supports the draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments", contained in document A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1. Our support for the draft resolution is based on our belief that the principle of transparency should also apply to nuclear weapons and to the transfers of equipment and technology directly related to the development and manufacture of such weapons. We therefore support the notion contained in the draft resolution that the need for the Register to increase transparency related to weapons of mass destruction should be further explored.

South Africa will, however, abstain in the voting on operative paragraph 4 (b) of the draft resolution as we do not believe that a linkage concerning weapons of mass destruction should be established with the current Register, which deals with conventional weapons.

Mr. Al-Ahmed (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation wishes to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 27 October 1999. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1 are listed in the draft resolution itself. Saudi Arabia has also become a sponsor of this draft resolution.

Separate votes have been requested on the eighth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4 (b).

The Committee will now vote on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

"*Stressing* the need to achieve universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, with a view to realizing the goal of the total elimination of all weapons of mass destruction".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

India, Israel

Abstaining:

Canada, Cuba, Pakistan

The eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A.C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1 was retained by 132 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Canada informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 4 (b) of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

> "*Requests* the Secretary-General, with the assistance of the Group of Governmental Experts to be convened in the year 2000 and taking into account the views submitted by Member States, to report to it at its fifty-fifth session on:
>
> (b) The elaboration of practical means for the development of the Register in order to increase transparency related to weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, and to transfers of equipment and technology directly related to the development and manufacture of such weapons".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Azerbaijan, Belarus, China, Georgia, India, Japan, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

Operative paragraph 4 (b) of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1 was retained by 77 votes to 45, with 16 abstentions.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel,

Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, China, Georgia, India, Japan, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 81 votes to 45, with 13 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China has always advocated the complete prohibition and total elimination of all weapons of mass destruction. To this end, ultimately it is necessary to adopt measures of transparency regarding these weapons. So far the international community has already worked out Conventions on the complete prohibition of chemical and biological weapons. The questions concerning transparency and verification for these two categories of weapons of mass destruction have either been settled or are being settled.

First and foremost, in the field of nuclear armaments is the promotion of the process of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear proliferation. The countries possessing the largest and most advanced nuclear arsenals should continue to take the lead by drastically reducing their nuclear arsenals and abandoning double standards or multiple standards on the question of proliferation so as to create conditions for the ultimate achievement of complete transparency and the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Transparency for nuclear arsenals has to be set against the background of peace, security, stability and confidence, and should be coupled with the process of negotiations on nuclear disarmament. At present some countries are still pursuing the nuclear doctrine of first use of nuclear weapons, promoting vigorously an anti-ballistic missile system that undermines the strategic balance and frequently using or threatening the use of force in international relations. Under these circumstances, the conditions are not ripe to call for non-discriminatory openness and transparency; and it is not fair, either.

For these reasons, and based on the fact that we have different points of view on the reconvening of the Group of Governmental Experts to address transparency in armaments and extending the scope of the Register, the Chinese delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1.

Mr. Itzhaki (Israel): My delegation voted against this draft resolution since we do not consider it necessary or useful to expand the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. In our view, such an expansion may impair the functioning of this instrument. Instead, we maintain that efforts should be devoted to encouraging those States that have not yet done so to join the Register.

In this regard, we are also surprised that some of the sponsors of the draft resolution from neighbouring countries in the Middle East call for expanding the Register while they themselves have so far failed to submit reports under the existing one.

Finally, as Israel submits its report to the United Nations Register on a yearly basis, we still maintain that transparency with regard to military holdings, both through imports and local production, can be effective only if based on regional arms control agreements and on principles of reciprocity and comprehensiveness.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): That brings to a close all our activity on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.21/Rev.1.

Since we are now exactly at the 24-hour point and ready for the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1, that brings us back to cluster 1. If no delegation wishes to make a general statement, I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1.

Mr. Pearson (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, could you please clarify what we are considering at this point?

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We are considering draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1. I have New Zealand on the list to speak before a decision is taken on this draft resolution.

Mr. Pearson (New Zealand): I do not wish to make a statement before a decision is taken. I want to make a statement in the context of a paragraph vote.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I suggest that the Ambassador of New Zealand make his statement at this point so that action can be taken on the draft. I greatly respect what you are saying, but since the paragraphs are part of the draft resolution, I think there is a certain logic to your making your statement before the draft resolution is put before the Committee for a decision. So I would ask you to make your statement.

Mr. Pearson (New Zealand): I am taking the floor on behalf of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden to explain our vote on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons".

The language in this paragraph raises significant problems for our delegations. In particular, we do not consider that the calls in this paragraph are consistent with the mandate for the 2000 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) Review Conference. That mandate is clear and unambiguous. It is set down in decision 1 of the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, dealing with the strengthening of the review process for the Treaty. It is on the basis of this mandate that the work of the 2000 Review Conference will proceed and decisions will be taken.

That is a consensus mandate. We consider that the language before us in operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1 is misleading and strays from that mandate. It raises questions about the status of the agreements reached at the 1995 Review Conference, and it attempts to prejudge the outcome of the 2000 Review Conference. We consider that the imperative in 2000 is to ensure the full implementation of the 1995 decisions and resolution and not merely their reaffirmation. We also consider it would be imprudent for this Committee to attempt to prejudge or pre-empt the outcomes of next year's Review Conference.

As States parties to the NPT, our seven delegations feel obliged, therefore, to abstain in the voting on operative paragraph 9.

Mr. Aamiry (Jordan): I should like to associate our delegation with the statement just made by the representative of New Zealand.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Japan at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 28 October 1999. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/54/INF/2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Austria, Australia, Canada, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Portugal and Spain.

Separate votes have been requested on the second preambular paragraph and on operative paragraphs 1 and 9.

The Committee will now vote on the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

> "*Bearing in mind* the recent nuclear tests, as well as the regional situations, which pose a challenge to international efforts to strengthen the global regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of

Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia

Against:
India

Abstaining:
Bhutan, Israel, Pakistan, Sierra Leone

The second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1 was retained by 130 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

"*Reaffirms* the importance of achieving the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and calls upon States not parties to the Treaty to accede to it without delay and without conditions".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:
Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia

Against:
India, Israel

Abstaining:
Bhutan, Cuba, Pakistan

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1 was retained by 134 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

"*Underlines* the vital importance of the 2000 Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons for the preservation and strengthening of the regime anchored therein, and calls upon all States parties to that Treaty to reaffirm the decisions as well as the resolution adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Treaty, and to intensify their efforts with a view to reaching an agreement on updated objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, based on the review of the achievements since 1995".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia

Against:

France

Abstaining:

Algeria, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, New Zealand, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Russian Federation, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Uruguay

Operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1 was retained by 103 votes to 1, with 27 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Lebanon informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bhutan, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, India, Israel, Mauritius, Myanmar, Pakistan, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 128 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Lebanon informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on the decisions just taken.

Ms. Kunadi (India): The delegation of India wishes to state its views with regard to certain aspects of the draft resolution on which it wishes to reserve its position.

India has an unwavering commitment to nuclear disarmament and the goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons globally. That is also the main objective of this draft resolution. However, the instrument designed to deal with nuclear weapons and promote global nuclear disarmament and genuine non-proliferation in all its aspects, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), has proved to be ineffective. The goal of global nuclear non-proliferation can be achieved if the international community looks beyond the old framework of the NPT and moves towards the goal of equal and legitimate security for all through global nuclear disarmament.

This year's draft resolution has added new elements — a moratorium on the production of fissile material in operative paragraph 4 (b), and the International Atomic Energy Agency Model Protocol in operative paragraph 8 — which are derived from the NPT framework. We also feel that the reference to nuclear tests in the second preambular paragraph is extraneous to this draft resolution. We called for separate votes on the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 and cast negative votes to express our reservations.

We also wish to state for the record that we do not agree with a number of the recommendations of the Tokyo Forum report, which is referred to in the sixth preambular paragraph.

Though we are not in a position to agree to several elements in this draft resolution we have maintained our abstention, given that we have no disagreement with the objective being sought: the global elimination of nuclear weapons. However, we feel that the essential elements regarding the political will and the call for negotiations are lacking in the draft resolution.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): My delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons". We did so because this draft resolution offers a more realistic vision of nuclear disarmament than other draft resolutions presented, both in terms of what has been accomplished to date and in terms of the difficult tasks that lie ahead. The United States is firmly committed to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons but remains convinced that this can be accomplished only through a step-by-step process. For the international community the next agreed step is a cut-off in the production of fissionable material, and no further delays in getting those negotiations going should be tolerated.

As for bilateral steps, while the United States may share the sponsors' optimism in looking beyond START III, as reflected in this draft resolution's operative paragraph 4 (d), our focus for now is simply to get the START III talks under way and headed in the right direction.

Although we supported the draft resolution, my Government has reservations regarding operative paragraph 9 and thus abstained in the voting on it. The United States of course agrees with the vital importance of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and is working together with others for its successful year 2000 Review Conference. However, we believe it inappropriate for the First Committee either to detail actions the Review Conference should take, such as reaffirmations, decisions, etc., or to specify Review Conference results. This prejudges what the Review Conference will do. The United States fully expects that the States parties will undertake what has been termed a backward and forward look at next year's NPT Review Conference, as agreed at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. Just how that is done should be up to the Review Conference itself to decide.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation agrees with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1, aimed at the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. However, this draft resolution also has some important defects. For instance, it fails to refer to the basic principle that countries possessing the largest and most advanced nuclear arsenals have special responsibilities in nuclear disarmament. Nor does it call for the abandonment of the nuclear doctrine characterized by the first use of nuclear weapons. Preventing the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty from being diminished or dissolved and curbing anti-ballistic missiles, which undermine the strategic balance of the world are preconditions for the promotion of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1 fails to mention this. In addition, many elements contained in the Tokyo Forum report are neither realistic nor reasonable. The Chinese delegation cannot agree to the reference to this report contained in draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1.

For these reasons, the Chinese delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1. We

hope that the relevant draft resolution can be improved next year so as to make it possible for us to support it.

Mr. Abdullayev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation would like to give the reasons for its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1. Our explanation in this case is especially necessary because we have traditionally supported draft resolutions on nuclear disarmament proposed by the delegation of Japan.

We have been impressed by the realistic approach of the draft resolutions submitted by Japan, unlike that of other draft resolutions on nuclear disarmament proposed for consideration by the First Committee's consideration. I observe with satisfaction that this realistic approach has been retained this year as well. We could on the whole support this draft resolution in other circumstances, with the exception, of course, of operative paragraph 9, about which we have some doubts. However, we abstained in the voting not only because of what the draft resolution contains but also because of what it does not contain. The draft resolution makes no reference to the problem of preservation and compliance with the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. There is a deep organic link between preserving the ABM Treaty and nuclear disarmament overall. The ABM Treaty is part of the process of reducing strategic weapons, including, of course, nuclear weapons. The lack of a direct reference in the draft resolution to the need to preserve and have strict compliance with the ABM Treaty is the major, compelling reason that forced us to abstain in the voting.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Algeria supports all efforts for non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. Nonetheless, my delegation believes that this draft resolution is a duplication of effort and in some ways even contradicts draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", which Algeria traditionally supports and co-sponsors, and which was adopted just yesterday by the Committee. Furthermore, the title given to this draft resolution does not seem to us to reflect exactly the content of this document. Some of the elements incorporated in this draft resolution are not in line with our view of nuclear disarmament, which is completely in accord with the view of the Non-Aligned Movement. Furthermore, the language used this year in operative paragraph 9 raises a certain number of problems because it detracts from the agreement painstakingly reached by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. As Algeria sees it, the 2000 Review Conference will decide whether new principles and objectives should be agreed upon for non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. That is why Algeria abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 9 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

We voted in favour of the second preambular paragraph, and we understand that it refers to all nuclear tests of any kind, wherever they occur.

Mr. Salazar (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 9 for the same reasons put forward very well by the Ambassador of New Zealand before the voting.

Mr. Al-Hariri (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation has always supported efforts to achieve complete nuclear disarmament, but we would like to enter our reservations regarding the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9 and operative paragraph 4 (a), concerning the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. My delegation regrets that no reference was made to the fact that Israel is the only country in the Middle East that has not adhered to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and is preventing the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, which is closely linked to nuclear disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Forquenot de la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): France regrets not having been able, as in the three previous years, to vote in favour of the draft resolution sponsored by Japan on nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. The wording in operative paragraph 9 causes my country to have some serious reservations, even if the draft resolution as a whole reflects my country's position and its commitment to non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament.

We have two reservations. First, in terms of procedure, it seems to us that it is not up to the General Assembly to decide what the outcome of the Review Conference of States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons should be. Secondly, as to substance, we consider that the text's call for an agreement on updated objectives for nuclear non-proliferation seems to us to prejudge the work of the Review Conference. Once again, it would be up to the States parties during the spring 2000 Conference to come to an agreement on the best ways and means to preserve and consolidate the regime based on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Mr. Al-Hassan (Oman): My delegation was present when the vote was taken on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.9/Rev.1. Had we been attentively present, we would not have participated in the voting on this operative paragraph, for reasons that are well known. Among those reasons is that it reiterates new language regarding the resolution of 1995 on the question of the Middle East, which we totally oppose.

Ms. Fiffe (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Once again, this year the Cuban delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons". The basic reason for our abstention is that in our view this draft resolution does not establish a minimum basis of universal acceptance in endeavours for nuclear disarmament. As we have pointed out since this draft resolution was introduced, in spite of its title, its real focus is not on nuclear disarmament but basically on questions that relate to non-proliferation, with special emphasis on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, an instrument that, as we have said, is discriminatory in nature and to which Cuba is not a party for well-known reasons. We believe that continuing to insist on partial approaches, as in this case, does not contribute to creating the necessary conditions for progress towards the ultimate objective of nuclear disarmament. On the contrary, they serve as a pretext for those who use them to promote their obsolete nuclear military doctrines.

For all these reasons, my delegation was not able to vote in favour of this draft resolution.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): That concludes our debate and action on all the draft resolutions before the Committee this morning. Unfortunately, because of time constraints we are not going to be able to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.30, bearing in mind the request that was made by the representative of Canada.

Mr. Westdal (Canada): In view of the change of time might I suggest that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.30 attend a meeting in Conference Room A as soon as we have finished this meeting. That will enable us to avoid delaying this afternoon's proceedings.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Unless the representative of Algeria objects, the Committee will meet at 3 p.m. sharp. There is really no alternative, so I do ask for your understanding.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): I beg your indulgence, but I have a proposal to make that would probably help facilitate the work of many delegations. Since tomorrow we have a meeting on Antarctica and we have only one draft resolution left to consider, would it not be possible, from the point of view of the Secretariat and the Chair, to consider this draft resolution before we begin our consideration of the question of Antarctica and thus avoid having to come back this afternoon for just one draft resolution? That would enable us to settle an enormous number of problems and to avoid exhausting the scant resources available to us with one meeting, which would probably not last more than 45 minutes.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I must inform the representative of Algeria that, unfortunately, because of certain technical problems that will not be possible. I ask for his understanding. For my part, I pledge to try to make the meeting this afternoon as brief as possible.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.